DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 513 24 CG 006 360

TITLE	Addendum: Analysis of Market Research Findings Utilizing Race and Income Variables for the Metropolitan Detroit Area and for Columbus, Ohio.
INSTITUTION	Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Lab., Inc., Detroit.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-6-1465
PUB DATE	Jun 69
NOTE	68p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Evaluation, *Income, Inner City, Parent Participation, Parent School Relationship, *Racial Attitudes, School Buildings, *Teacher Evaluation, Urban Environment, *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This analysis, using race and income variables, presents market research findings for the metropolitan Detroit area and for Columbus, Ohio. The four sections are divided into: (I) summary statements for metropolitan Detroit; (II) description of findings for metropolitan Detroit area; (III) summary statements for Columbus data; and (IV) description of findings for Columbus. Sections II and IV present more detailed descriptions of the findings discussed in sections I and III with section III containing an additional statement on differences between the Columbus and Detroit data. Also included are tables for opinion-polling in Detroit and Columbus. Analysis is made of demographic characteristics of the samples in both areas; perceptions of the public school system; evaluation of teachers; evaluation of curriculum; evaluation of school buildings; parental involvement and influence in schools; and racial attitudes regarding schools. (TA)

ED049513

June, 1969

ADDENDUM

ANALYSIS OF MARKET RESEARCH FINDINGS UTILIZING RACE AND INCOME VARIABLE FOR THE METROPOLITAN DETROIT AREA AND FOR COLUMBUS, OHIO

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory
3750 Woodward Avenue - Detroit, Michigan 48201

CG 006 360

Published by the Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory, a private non-profit corporation supported in part as a regional educational laboratory by funds from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education & Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

June, 1969

FOREWORD

Dr. Patricia Gurin, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, has reported her findings and conclusions after an analysis of selected data was made on the basis of responses by race and income. (The race and income breakdowns were not available at the time that Market Opinion Research presented its "Executive Summary" on March 6, 1969.)

Section I presents summary statements drawn from the Detroit data and Section II is a more detailed description of those findings. Section III presents summary statements from the Columbus data and is followed by a more detailed description of findings from Columbus in Section IV.

Delmo Della-Dora, Director
Planning and Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Summary Statements, Metropolitan Detroit Area Findings.....1

A. Demographic Characteristics of Three Samples.....1

B. Perceptions of Public School System.....2

C. Evaluation of Teachers.....3

D. Evaluation of Curriculum.....5

E. Evaluation of Buildings.....6

F. Parental Involvement and Influence in Schools.....6

G. Racial Attitudes.....7

II. Description of Findings, Metropolitan Detroit Area.....8

A. Demographic Characteristics of Inner, Middle and Suburban Sample.....8

1. Relationship Between These Two Controls and Other Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents Within Each Sector of the City.....9

2. Involvement of the Respondents in Public and Non-Public Schools.....11

3. Relationship of Race and Income to Paying of Property Taxes.....13

B. Perceptions of the Public School System.....13

C. Evaluation of Teachers.....16

D. Curriculum.....19

E. Evaluation of School Buildings.....21

F. Parental Involvement and Influence in School Affairs.....21

G. Racial Attitudes.....23

TABLES FOR METROPOLITAN DETROIT AREA OPINION POLLING .....27 - 34

III. Summary Statements, Columbus Data.....35

A. Demographic Characteristics of the Two Samples.....35

B. Perception of the System as a Whole.....36

C. Evaluation of Teachers.....36

D. Evaluation of Curriculum.....36

E. Evaluation of School Buildings.....37

F. Parental Involvement and Influence in Schools.....37

G. Racial Attitudes.....37

H. Differences Between the Columbus and Detroit Data.....38

IV. Description of Findings, Columbus.....40

A. Demographic Characteristics of the Inner and Middle Samples in Columbus.....40

1. Relationship Between Race and Other Demographic Characteristics.....41

2. Relationships Between Income and Other Demographic Characteristics.....42

3. Involvement of the Respondents in Public and Non-Public Schools.....43

4. Relationship of Race and Income to Paying of Property Taxes.....44

B. Perceptions of the Public School System.....45

C. Evaluation of Teachers.....47

D. Evaluation of School Buildings and Curriculum.....47

E. Parental Involvement and Influence in School Affairs.....49

F. Racial Attitudes.....50

TABLES FOR COLUMBUS, OHIO OPINION POLLING.....53 - 63

I. Summary Statements, Metropolitan Detroit Area Findings

A. Demographic Characteristics of the Three Samples

1. In contrast to the middle-city and suburban areas, the inner-city is characterized by a much larger proportion of Negroes and lower income residents. Still, Negroes and whites in the inner-city are fairly comparable in terms of income.

2. The median age of the three samples is fairly similar. In both the middle-city and suburbia it is 40-49 years; in the inner-city, 30-39.

   a. Negroes in the inner-city are significantly older than the whites, while Negroes in the middle-city are somewhat younger than whites.

   b. In both the middle-city and suburbia the low income sample is predominantly an older age group. Therefore, in these two sections of the city, we must be cautious about interpreting income differences when it is the low income group that stands out from all other groups.

3. As we move from the inner-city out to suburbia, education of the respondents increases.

   a. Still, within each sector of the city, blacks and whites have very comparable educational attainments.

   b. Within each sector of the city, income is very highly related to education. The relationship is sharpest in suburbia.

4. The proportion of the sample who have children is very much the same regardless of the section of the city. Over three-fourths of the respondents are parents.
5. At least half of each sample, except in the middle-city where it is only 40 per cent, have children currently in the public schools.
   a. The somewhat greater enrollment of children in non-public schools in the middle-city is explained entirely by the white parents. About one-fourth of them, but none of the Negro parents, are sending their children to non-public schools. In the inner-city, however, this race difference does not exist.
   b. The race difference in the middle-city particularly stands out, since there are no income differences (except those which could be explained by the older age of the low income group).

B. Perceptions of the Public School System

1. When asked to cite the major problem of the public schools, inner-city residents talk of concerns about teachers and, to some extent, over-crowding, more than do either middle-city or suburban residents. The latter two are somewhat more concerned about discipline and lack of respect among children.
2. Evaluation of how well elementary, junior high and senior high schools are preparing students for jobs is consistent, and

fairly negative, in all sections of the city. In the inner-city, parents are just as critical of elementary as of other schools. In the middle-city and suburbia, complaints are much stronger against the junior and senior high levels.

a. In both the inner- and middle-city, blacks are considerably more critical than are whites. This is true despite the fact that income differences are not related to how the schools are judged in any sector of the city.

b. An implication is that blacks would be very supportive of any programs that would do something positive about the education-job link for their children.

C. Evaluation of Teachers

In the answers to several questions we see a very consistent picture of how teachers are evaluated in different sections of the city. Inner-city residents always form the most critical group. This is seen in a number of ways:

1. As already mentioned, inner-city residents talk about teacher concerns more frequently than do middle-city or suburban respondents in evaluating the public school system as a whole.
2. Inner-city residents more frequently talk about teachers (wanting them to be more aware of the home situation and to provide better counseling for children) than do respondents in either of the other sections when they are asked what the schools should do to meet community needs.

3. Both inner- and middle-city respondents are more critical than are suburban residents when they are asked to rate teachers generally. Furthermore, inner-city residents are consistently more critical in their ratings of teachers at all levels of schooling -- elementary, junior high, and senior high school.
4. In talking about reasons for being dissatisfied with elementary school teachers, inner-city respondents more often stress the lack of adequate numbers of teachers. Moreover, in giving reasons for being critical of teachers generally, both inner- and middle-city respondents, more than people in suburbia, stress lack of interest on the part of teachers and inadequate counseling.
5. More inner-city parents than either middle-city or suburban parents feel their children are less satisfied with their teachers, particularly at the elementary and junior high school levels.
6. More inner-city parents than either middle-city or suburban parents feel their children are dissatisfied with their teachers. This is by no means a majority of the parents in any section of the city, but the greatest dissatisfaction is expressed in the inner-city.
7. By and large, blacks and whites, as well as the different income groups within different sectors of the city evaluate teachers in much the same way. The only question on which we find any race differences is that blacks, more than whites, in the inner-city mention teacher concerns in evaluating the

system as a whole. But, on all the other questions, the reactions are much the same regardless of race or income.

D. Evaluation of Curriculum

1. Criticism of school curriculum is greatest in the inner-city, although still only about a third of the inner-city parents say they are dissatisfied. (Neither blacks and whites, nor different income groups, differ in the degree of criticism they express in any sector of the city.)
2. Inner- and middle-city parents are also more likely to feel that new courses should be added to the curriculum. This is true equally of blacks and whites and regardless of income of the respondent.

   The number of people who responded to probes about what kinds of courses should be added is so small that we should be cautious about generalizing. Still, it is true that more inner-city parents would like to see more Afro-American history, while more suburban parents would like to see additional language courses.
3. More inner-city parents, particularly black parents, report that courses on Negro history are currently being offered. Only 3 per cent of suburban parents but about one-half of the inner-city parents say that such courses are bing offered.

E. Evaluation of Buildings

Inner- and middle-city residents are considerably less satisfied than are suburban residents with school buildings. Furthermore, reasons for dissatisfaction are considerably different. Inner-city residents stress needing more and less rundown facilities. Suburban residents stress being dissatisfied with current stress on frills, and they want more functional buildings.

Dissatisfaction in the middle- and inner-city is particularly pronounced among black respondents in contrast to white respondents. The various income populations do not differ, however, in how satisfied they are with school buildings in any section of the city.

F. Parental Involvement and Influence in Schools

1. Although the differences are not striking, inner-city parents are somwhat more involved than are middle-city or suburban parents in school affairs--visiting the school, telephoning the principal or teacher, belonging to and attending PTA.
   a. Blacks and whites in both the inner- and middle-city are very similar with respect to involvement.
   b. In the inner-city, low and moderate income groups are most involved, while in the middle-city and suburbia the most involved are from the high income group.
2. Respondents in the middle-city, regardless of whether they have children or not, feel themselves to have the least influence over the operation of the schools.

a. More blacks than whites, in both inner- and middle-city feel they can exercise influence. Still, these are differences of only about 15 per cent.

b. What is more striking than these race differences is the fact that, in all sections of the city, it is high income parents who feel they have the greatest influence.

3. An important but rather paradoxical situation in the inner-city is described by these data. In the inner-city, it is the low and moderate income groups who are most involved, on one hand. But, in the middle-city, and suburban areas, involvement and influence are associated with income in much the same way. High-income people are more involved and believe themselves to be the most influential.

G. Racial Attitudes

1. To the respondents in both the inner-city and suburban areas, integration must mean just a sprinkling of children from different races. Two-thirds of inner-city residents, regardless of race, said their schools are integrated despite the fact that most of the schools in the areas sampled are predominantly Negro. And two-fifths of suburban residents (even more of the suburban parents) say their schools are integrated despite the fact that the areas sampled have schools with no Negro enrollment.

2. Well over half of the sample, and nearly three-fourth of parents, in all areas of the city favor integration as well

as feel that the schools should be used to improve race relations. Furthermore, these attitudes are not much related to income in any area of the city.

3. What we do find are some striking race differences in the middle-city, where a much smaller proportion of whites than of blacks favor integration, feel that integration has been successful, and feel the schools should make an effort to improve race relation. In the inner-city, there is not this difference between attitudes of blacks and whites.
4. Very few respondents in the study were willing to use the term racist to describe the schools.

II. Description of Findings, Metropolitan Detroit Area

A. Demographic Characteristics of the Inner, Middle, and Suburban Samples

The inner, middle, and suburban samples differ greatly in both race and income. Over three-quarters of the inner-city sample, but only about one-fifth of the middle-city and none of the suburban sample, is Negro (see Table A). The inner-city sample reports earning less than $7,000 a year, wheras a much larger proportion of both the middle and suburban samples report earning $10,000 or more (see Table B).

Given these differences in the three samples, it is important to control for both race and income in drawing conclusions about the school attitudes and experiences of respondents living in the three sectors of the city. The size of the sample, however, makes it impossible to control for both race and income simultaneously. Therefore, in the tables to follow, we will present each of the controls separately.

To feel comfortable about using race and income as separate controls, however, we need to show that they are not strongly related themselves. For instance, every time we control for race in the inner-city, there is also the possibility of income differences confounding our interpretations. Fortunately, this turns out not to be the case (see Table C). Race and income are not strongly related to each other in any sector of the city. Although there is a slight tendency in the inner-city for Negroes to have somewhat lower income and whites to appear in greater numbers in the moderate income category, these differences are not statistically significant. The middle-city income distributions of Negroes and whites are also very similar.

1. Relationships Between These Two Controls and Other Demographic Chacteristics of the Respondents Within Each Sector of the City

In the inner-city,respondents from the Negro sample are significantly older that are those from the white sample (see Table D). Approximately four-fifths of the Negro sample are at least 40 years of age, whereas, only one-quarter of the white sample are older than forty. In contrast, in the middle-city the Negroes in the sample are somewhat younger than are the whites. About half of the Negroes but only about a third of the whites are younger than forty. The age differences between Negroes and whites in the inner-city are reflected in the marital status of the two groups. In the inner-city a smaller proportion of the white than of the Negro sample is separated, divorced or widowed and a larger proportion is still single (see Table E). This is understandable since the average age of the inner-city white sample is also significantly younger than the average age of the Negro sample. In the

middle-city, however, the marital status within the Negro and white samples is very comparable. Finally, we are also interested in whether there is any relationship between race and education of the respondents in either the inner- or middle-city. Just as there were no significant income differences, there are no educational differences between Negroes and whites in either sector of the city (see Table F).

Income is significantly related to age, marital status, and education in all three sectors of the city. Let us look first at the relationships with age. Here the picture is somewhat different in the inner-city than in either the middle-city or suburban areas. In the inner-city, high-income respondents are significantly older than are middle-income people; low-income respondents are bimodal with respect to age -- compared with the high-income group, a larger proportion is younger than thirty, and there is a larger proportion older than sixty than in either the middle or high income groups (see Table G). In contrast, in both the middle and suburban areas, moderate- and high-income respondents are very similar with respect to age. What stands out in these two areas of the city is the fact that approximately three-quarters of the low income respondents are sixty years or older. This means that whenever we are talking about how the attitudes and perceptions of low-income people residing in either the middle- or suburban areas differ from higher income people, these differences may reflect the peculiar age distribution of the low-income groups. Since it is impossible to control for both

income and age simultaneously, we should be cautious in interpreting income differences where it is the low-income groups that stands out from all other groups. At least in the middle- and suburban areas, this may result from age differences instead. For instance, these age differences could certainly explain differences in the marital status of low, middle, and high income groups in middle and suburban area. Table H shows that a much larger proportion of low-income people in both the middle-city and suburbs have experienced a death of a spouse. This would be expected, however, given the larger numbers who are older than sixty. On the other hand, in the inner-city, income differences probably mean something other than age. Although high-income people tend to be somewhat older, there is a slight tendency for more high-income people to be unmarried, at least in comparison with low-income. Low-income people, in contrast, are more likely than middle- or high-income groups to be separated from their spouses. Finally the relationship between income and education is exactly what would be expected, the lower the income the lower the educational attainment of the respondent. This is true in all sectors of the city (see Table I).

2. Involvement of the Respondents in Public and Non-public Schools

It is probably helpful to summarize the questions about the respondents' childrens' relationships to schools according to different sectors of the city. In the inner-city, we find that neither Negroes and whites nor the different income groups differ in whether they have children, whether their children are currently

enrolled in the public school system, and whether they have any children enrolled in non-public schools. In the middle-city, however, we do find some income and race differences. Poor people in the inner-city are less likely to have children in either the public or non-public schools despite the fact that they are just as likely as moderate or high-income groups to be parents. This probably means that the income differences reflect the fact that poor people in the middle-city are predominantly so much older than moderate or high-income respondents that, simply by virtue of their age, they are less likely to have youngsters in school at all. The race differences, however, are not likely to be spurious in the sense of being explainable by some other factor such as age. When we compare Negroes and whites in the middle-city, we find a significantly larger proportion of Negroes (54 per cent versus 33 per cent of white respondents) sending their youngsters to non-public schools. This is true despite the fact that there are no racial differences in the percentage who have children. This racial difference in enrollment in public and non-public schools helps interpret the finding that it is in the middle-city where attendance in non-public schools is greatest. What it really means is that whites in the middle-city are more likely than Negroes in the middle-city or whites in either the inner or suburban sectors of the city to send their youngsters to non-public schools. In suburbia, we can examine only income differences, since there are no Negroes in the suburban sample to give a race comparison. Low income people in suburbia

are considerably less likely (54 per cent versus approximately 90 per cent of moderate- and high-income people) to have children at all. Among those who are parents, however, there are no income differences in the proportion sending their youngsters to public and non-public schools. In other words, high income in suburbia does not mean a greater frequency of private school enrollment, as one might expect.

3. Relationship of Race and Income to Paying of Property Taxes

We know from the MOR report that a much larger proportion of middle and suburban respondents do pay property taxes; we also learn that these area differences hold, controlling for race and income. In the middle-city there are no race or income differences; in suburbia there are no income differences. In the inner-city, Negroes and whites do not differ in the percentage paying property taxes, although there are very large differences between income groups. Deleting the people who did not respond to this question we found that 81 percent of the high-income respondents in the inner-city but only 50 per cent of low- and moderate-income respondents report paying taxes that would go for school purposes.

B. Perceptions of the Public School System

Inner city respondents seem to express greater concern about teachers when they are asked to cite the major problem of the public school system. If we add together all of the teacher concerns (teachers lacking interest, not enough teachers, lack of communication

between parents and teachers) and recalculate the percentages, deleting the nonrespondents, we see that 33 per cent of the inner-city sample but only 20 per cent of the middle-city and 16 per cent of the suburban groups mention teacher concerns. There is also a slight tendency for inner-city respondents to stress overcrowding somewhat more than do middle or suburban respondents. Inner- and middle-city respondents share in common a somewhat greater, although still quite limited, concern about bussing of children. This is not a concern at all among the suburban respondents. The suburban sample is more likely to evaluate the system as having no problems or to stress discipline problems. After deleting NR's, 29 per cent of the suburban but only 18 per cent of inner-city respondnets mentioned discipline in evaluating the system as a whole. Still, the clearest difference in these data is the greater concern in the inner-city with issues about teachers. This is something that should not be missed by having all of the different types of teachers responses separated in the table present in the MOR report.

The only place where we find any race differences in how respondents perceive the system as a whole is in the inner-city. Inner-city white respondents are much more concerned than are the Negro respondents about problems of discipline and somewhat less concerned about teacher issues. Deleting the nonrespondents, 35 per cent of the inner-city white group, but only 14 per cent of the Negro group, mentioned discipline problems. Conversely, only 21 per cent of the whites, but 45 per cent of the Negroes, mention teacher issues

of one sort or another. It is probably important to note that in neither the inner- nor the middle-city do Negroes and whites differ in how they react to bussing. Moreover, there are really no race differences in how the system is perceived by respondents in the middle-city.

Certain income differences are consistent in all three sectors of the city. Low-income respondents generally are more concerned about discipline problems. In the middle-city and suburbia this could reflect the concerns of the large number of older people in the low-income groups. Still, this finding holds up in the inner-city as well, where age cannot so easily explain the heightened concern with discipline among low-income people. Deleting people who did not respond to this question, 37 per cent of inner-city low-income respondents but only 19 per cent of the moderate and none of the high-income groups are concerned about discipline and lack of respect in the schools. In addition, inner-city income groups differ in another way. Moderate- and high-income Rs are much more critical than are low-income of overcrowding in the schools. In the middle-city we see still another income difference. Concern about bussing is much more frequent among low-income (20 per cent) than either moderate- (6 per cent) or high-income (4 per cent) respondents. Otherwise, however, reactions to the system as a whole are not very much differentiated by income.

The heightened teacher concerns in the inner-city are supported by responses to questions about what schools should do to meet community needs. Inner-city respondents mention "teachers be more aware

of the home situation" and "providing counseling for students" more frequently than do either middle or suburban respondents -- 30 percent of the inner-city sample who answered the question versus five percent of the middle-city and two percent of the suburban respondents. These two criticisms seem to have more to do with intra-school issues than what schools should do to meet community needs. Overall, the responses to this question seem to indicate that inner-city respondents are not as concerned about after-school use of schools or community-school relationships as they are eager for schools to do a good job of educating and helping their children.

C. Evaluation of Teachers

Teachers are evaluated differently in the three different areas of the city. When the respondents were asked whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied with teachers in their community, both inner- and middle-city respondents were generally more critical than were suburban respondents. (Deleting the nonrespondents, 24 percent of the inner-city parents, 23 percent of middle-city parents, but only 10 percent of suburban parents said they were dissatisfied with teachers in the public schools.) The much more telling data comes from asking parents to evaluate teachers at the different school levels, elementary, junior high and senior high, on a scale ranging from excellent to poor. As one moves from the inner-city to suburbia, there is a significant decrease in the proportion of parents who evaluate teachers as being either "fair" or "poor." Deleting the non-

respondents, 36 percent of inner-city parents, 18 percent of middle-city, and only eight percent of suburban parents react to elementary school teachers as being either fair or poor. At the junior high level, 50 percent of the inner-city parents, 31 percent of the middle-city 16 percent of suburban parents are that critical. The differences at the senior high level are almost exactly the same as those at the junior high level.

When we look at the possibility of race and income differences in the way parents evaluate teachers, we see that Negroes and whites share very similar evaluations within each sector of the city. Similarly, low-income people react to teachers in almost exactly the same ways as do moderate- and high-income parents. There is no evidence from the race and income controls that either race or income affect the relationships we have just described. In other words, inner-city residents are most critical of teachers, but this is equally true of both blacks and whites and of both high- and low-income groups.

The types of problems that parents talk about in discussing teachers are difficult to summarize anywhere except at the elementary school level, because the number of nonrespondents is too large when parents talk about junior high and senior high teachers. Still, it is possible to draw some conclusions from the responses at the elementary level. Both inner- and middle-city parents feel that overcrowding and inadequate number of teachers are more important problems than do suburban parents. And, inner-city parents mention lack of teacher qualifications more frequently than do either middle or suburban parents. We find support for this heightened concern with

teachers also in the reasons respondents are dissatisfied with teachers in general. Since this question was asked only of those who said they were dissatisfied, the Ns are very small. Still, inner- (42 per cent) and middle-city (36 percent) parents are much more concerned with poor counseling and lack of teacher interest than are suburban (7 percent) parents. In contrast, suburban parents are more concerned with lack of discipline. Significantly, no inner-city parents mention this in talking about why they are dissatisfied with teachers. Both inner-city and suburban parents mention teacher qualifications as one of their reasons for dissatisfaction.

It is impossible to control for race and income in interpreting these reasons for criticism of teachers. The Ns simply get much too small because of the large number of nonrespondents and of people who were not supposed to answer the question, even before race and income controls are introduced. However, given that the ratings of the teachers did not differ by race or income, reasons for dissatisfaction and criticism might be expected not to differ by race and income either.

One other question that concerns teacher evaluation has to do with what parents think their children feel about teachers. Particularly at the elementary and junior high levels, parents of inner-city children feel that their children are less satisfied with their teachers than do either middle or suburban parents. Again this is difficult to investigate for possible income or race differences, since the number of nonrespondents is very large.

D. Curriculum

Criticism of the school curriculum is greatest in the inner-city and decreases somewhat in the middle-city and even more in suburban areas. When we look for possible race differences, we find that blacks and whites in the inner-city are equally critical; this is also true of blacks and whites in the middle-city. Similarly, high, moderate and low-income groups view curricular issues in very much the same way. In other words, inner-city residents are more critical, but this is just as true of high-income as low-income respondents. Conversely, suburban respondents are less critical but this is just as true of low- as high-income people.

It is not possible to look for race and income differences in reasons for criticisms or suggestions about new courses that ought to be offered in the schools. The Ns are simply too small to explore the responses of blacks and whites or different income groups separately.

Evaluation of the School's Capacity to Prepare Students for Jobs

We learn from the MOR report that parents in all sections of the city are consistent in their evaluation of how well the public school system prepares students for jobs. This holds controlling for race and income. What is interesting are the sizable race differences within the inner-city and within the middle-city. Blacks are much more critical of the success of the school, at all grade levels -- elementary, junior high, and senior high -- in preparing students for jobs. The race differences are largest in evaluation of elementary schools and particularly in the inner-city, where 78 percent of

the black respondents but none of the white respondents felt the elementary schools are doing either a "fair" or "poor" job of preparing students for eventual jobs. The polarization of race attitudes is generally stronger in the inner-city. In evaluating junior high schools on this matter, 73 percent of the Negro respondents, but only 17 percent of the whites, felt the schools are either fair or poor. At the senior high level, 81 percent of the blacks, but only 14 percent of the whites, were this critical of the schools. These are enormous differences between the two groups. The race differences in the middle-city are also large, but not quite as striking as in the inner-city. At the elementary school level, 63 percent of the blacks and 23 percent of the whites were this critical; at the junior high level 65 percent of the blacks and 30 percent of the whites; at the senior high level, 59 percent of the blacks and 36 percent of the whites.

Given these very striking race differences, it is interesting that we find that income differences are not related to how the schools are judged in any sector of the city. Inner-city residents are more critical, but this is just as true of high- as low-income respondents. Suburban residents are less critical, but this is equally true of low- as of high-income groups.

The fact that we find these very striking race differences but no income differences at all has clear implications for schools and their programs. It is not simply that low-income people, many of whom are likely to be black, feel the schools are inadequately preparing their youngsters for jobs; instead, it is very clear that the criticism

of the schools comes from blacks, regardless of income. Furthermore, these criticisms of black parents are almost as strong in the middle-city, where the schools might be expected to be doing a somewhat better job, as they are in the inner-city.

E. Evaluation of School Buildings

Criticism of school buildings is greatest among inner- and middle-city respondents. When we control for race, we find that this is particularly true of Negroes in the inner- and middle-city. In both areas of the city, blacks are less satisfied than are whites with school buildings. Only approximately 60 percent of the black respondents, but 85 percent of the white respondents, said they were satisfied.

The various income groups do not differ, however, in their evaluations of buildings. This is true in every sector of the city.

Because of very small Ns, it is not possible to control for either race or income in exploring the reasons for dissatisfaction with school buildings.

F. Parental Involvement and Influence in School Affairs

The MOR report indicates, contrary to some rather common assumptions, that, compared with middle-city and suburban parent, inner-city parents visit schools more frequently (64 percent versus 46 percent in the middle-city and 55 percent in the suburban areas report visiting three or more times a year); belong more frequently to PTA or PTO groups (46 percent versus 38 percent in the middle-city and 36 percent in the suburban areas); attend PTA meeting some-

what more frequently (66 percent, versus 64 percent in the middle-city and 54 percent in suburban areas, report going three to five times a year). Inner-city parents also feel that they have greater influence over the operation of the public school system (54 percent, versus 23 percent in the middle-city and 43 percent in suburban areas, say they feel they do have some influence).

Blacks and whites in the inner-city, as well as blacks and whites in the middle-city, are very similar regarding these measures of school involvement. Race is not significant anywhere except that middle-city black parents do belong to PTA in larger numbers than white parents in the middle-city.

We do find interesting income differences which take opposite directions in the inner-city on the one hand and in suburbia and the middle-city on the other. In the inner-city, low- and moderate-income groups report visiting the school more frequently than do high-income parents, telephoning the teacher more frequently, belonging to PTA in larger numbers, and attending PTA more frequently. In contrast, in suburbia and the middle-city it is the high-income parents who are most involved. The common assumption of greater involvement among higher-income groups is supported by the data only in suburban areas. In the inner-city, high-income parents are least involved.

Finally, we are interested in whether there are any race and income differences in the extent to which people feel they can influence the operation of the public schools. Here we find consistent race and income differences. Blacks consistently feel they have greater influence than do whites. In the inner-city 47 percent of

the Negro sample, but only 26 percent of the white sample, answer yes to this question; in the middle-city, 39 percent of the blacks, but only 24 percent of the whites, responded affirmatively. In all sectors of the city it is the high-income people who feel they have the greatest influence. In the inner-city 47 percent of the high income group, 35 percent of the moderate- and 29 percent of the low-income group felt they had some influence; in the middle-city 34 percent of high-income versus 22 percent of the moderate- and 12 percent of the low-income group; and in suburban areas 47 percent of the high income group, 42 percent of the moderate-income, but only 13 percent of the low income group felt they could influence the schools.

Looking at both influence and involvement, it is interesting that in suburbia high-income people are both more involved in school affairs and also feel they have greater influence over the public schools than do moderate- or low-income people. But in the inner-city, the low- and moderate-income groups are the more involved in school affairs although fewer of them than of the high-income group feel they can influence the public school. This means that in the inner-city there is a disparity between involvement and perception of influence as experienced by low- and moderate-income groups whereas in suburbia, this is not the case.

G. Racial Attitudes

The MOR report shows that inner-city residents (equally parents and nonparents) favor integration of the schools more strongly than do either middle-city or suburban residents. Residents in the middle-city are the least favorable. In both the middle-city and suburbia,

parents are more favorable than nonparents.

The three sections of the city do not differ, however, in evaluating how successful integration has been. About 40 to 45 percent of each of the samples, whether parents or not, feel it has been successful.

Somewhat more of the inner-city residents feel that the public schools are racist; nevertheless, this is still a very small proportion (15 percent) of the sample. Less than ten percent of middle- and suburban residents feel this term can be applied to the public schools.

The three sections do not differ in whether they feel the public schools <u>should</u> make an effort to improve race relations. About three-fourths of each sample feel they should. It is true, however, the somewhat fewer of the suburban residents feel that the schools <u>are</u> making an effort. Half of the suburban residents, but four-fifths of the respondents in the other two sections of the city, say their schools are trying to improve race relations.

When we examine whether blacks and whites differ in their racial attitudes, we find some striking <u>race differences</u>, at least in the middle-city of Detroit. There a much smaller proportion of the white respondents than of the black respondents favor integration, feel integration has been successful, and feel the schools should make an effort to improve race relations. These differences are very sizable and further highlight the polarization of whites and blacks in the middle-city. One interesting reversal from the pattern of whites being more critical of integration or school efforts in the area of race is the fact that the proportion of whites who feel the schools are racist has increased, not decreased. Twenty percent of

the whites who answered this question, but none of the blacks, say the schools are racist. This finding results from 12 white respondents who must stand out in very significant ways from the remainder of the white sample in the middle-city. In the inner-city, blacks and whites share similar attitudes, although they differ slightly in their perceptions about what is happening. A larger proportion of blacks say that courses on Negro history are being taught, and a lower proportion of blacks say that the schools are currently making an effort to improve race relations. Finally, it is also true that a larger proportion of blacks (28 percent of those who answered the question) feel that the schools are racist. Only ten percent of the whites in the inner-city who answered this question would apply the term racist to the schools.

From previous research we generally expect to find more "liberal" views from higher income people. These data support this view, but only with respect to attitudes toward integration. In the inner-city and in suburbia, high-income people are more favorable toward integration than are low-income people. In suburbia, particularly, this is a sizable difference - 82 percent of high-income versus 50 percent of low-income people. Except for this result, however, we find that income has little bearing on attitudes. Income does not differentiate attitudes in the middle-city at all. This means that the less supportive views of whites in the middle-city are just as characteristic of high-income as of low-income whites there. One perception of what is happening is linked to income, but in different

directions in suburbia as opposed to the two other sections of the city. High-income residents in suburbia feel integration has been more successful than do either middle- or low-income groups. In contrast, the inner- and middle-city high-income respondents evaluate integration as being considerably less successful. Experiences with integration are probably very different for the different sections of the city. In suburbia, token integration is probably what the experience is. Perhaps this allows high-income people to feel that integration is going well in ways that high-income people in other sections of the city do not see.

TABLE A

Breakdown of Inner, Middle, Suburban
Sample by Race

	Inner	Middle	Suburban
Negro	78.5%	19.9%	-- %
White	21.5	74.8	99.4
Other	--	5.3	.6
	100 %	100 %	100 %
	(107)	(151)	(154)

TABLE B

Breakdown of Inner, Middle, Suburban Sample
by Income, Deleting Refusals

	Inner	Middle	Suburban
Less than $7,000	42 %	17.8%	18.4%
$7,000 - 9,999	34.1	29.5	14.9
$10,000 or more	23.9	52.1	66.7
	100%	100%	100%
	(88)	(146)	(141)

TABLE C

Relationship Between Race and Income
for Inner- and Middle-City

	Inner		Middle	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
Less than $7,000	46%	30%	16%	18%
7,000 - 9,999	29	48	38	28
$10,000 or more	25	22	46	55
	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE D

Relationship Between Race and Age of Respondents

	Inner		Middle	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
18 - 20 years	1.2%	13.0%	6.7%	2.7%
21 - 29	20.5	30.4	23.3	8.8
30 - 39	20.5	30.4	20.0	22.1
40 - 49	21.7	4.3	30.0	22.1
50 - 59	20.5	8.7	10.0	23.9
60 - 64	4.8	0	3.3	5.3
65 and over	10.8	13.0	6.7	15.0

TABLE E

Relationship Between Marital Status and Race of Respondents

	Inner		Middle	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
Married	74.7%	82.6%	83.3%	87.6%
Married/Separated	7.2	0	0	0
Single	8.4	17.4	3.3	7.1
Divorced	6.0	0	3.3	0
Widow/Widower	3.6	0	10.0	5.3

TABLE F

Relationship Between Race and Education

	Inner		Middle	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
Grade school or less	18.1%	17.4%	16.7%	12.4%
Some high school	28.9	30.4	23.3	18.6
Graduated high school	33.7	30.4	36.7	41.6
Some college	10.8	13.0	10.0	16.8
Graduated college	4.8	0	13.3	6.2
Post-graduate	3.6	8.7	0	3.5

TABLE G

Relationship Between Income and Age of Respondents

	Inner			Middle			Suburban		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
18 - 20 yrs.	5.4%	6.7%	0 %	0 %	9.3%	2.6%	0%	0 %	0 %
21 - 29	24.3	26.7	14.3	14.8	9.3	13.2	3.8	9.5	10.6
30 - 39	16.2	33.3	19.0	0	25.6	27.6	7.7	19.0	35.1
40 - 49	13.5	13.3	38.1	14.8	27.9	28.9	3.8	38.1	37.2
50 - 59	13.5	10.0	23.8	3.7	23.3	21.1	7.2	28.6	12.8
60 - 64	5.4	6.7	4.8	11.1	4.7	2.6	19.2	4.8	4.3
65 and over	21.6	6.7	0	63.0	0	3.9	57.7	0	0

TABLE H

Relationship Between Marital Status and Income of Respondent

	Inner			Middle			Suburban		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
Married	78.4%	86.7%	81.8%	66.7%	86.0%	92.1%	88.5%	95.2%	97.9%
Married/ Separated	10.8	0	0	3.7	0	0	0	4.8	1.1
Single	8.1	13.3	14.3	0	9.3	6.6	0	0	1.1
Divorced	0	0	0	0	2.3	0	0	0	0
Widow/ Widower	2.7	0	0	29.6	2.3	1.3	11.5	0	0

TABLE I

Relationship Between Income and Education

	Inner			Middle			Suburban		
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
Grade school or less	32.4%	13.3%	4.8%	33.3%	9.3%	11.8%	48.0%	9.5%	1.1%
Some high school	32.4	33.3	4.8	18.5	25.6	13.2	24.0	38.1	9.6
Graduated high school	29.7	26.7	47.6	37.0	48.8	40.8	36.0	42.9	31.9
Some college	2.7	3.3	9.5	7.4	0	11.8	12.0	4.8	23.4
Graduated college	2.7	3.3	9.5	7.4	0	11.8	12.0	4.8	18.1
Post-graduate	0	0	14.3	0	2.3	3.9	4.0	0	16.0

TABLE I

Relationship Between Race of Respondents
and Racial Attitudes in Different Sections of the City

After Deleting Nonrespondents, Percent Who:	Inner		Middle	
	Negroes	Whites	Negroes	Whites
Favor Integration	93% (N = 82)	83% (N = 22)	94% (N = 31)	54% (N = 99)
	NS		Sig .001	
Feel Integration Has Been Successful	59% (N = 68)	51% (N = 22)	78% (N = 27)	45% (N = 96)
	NS		Sig .001	
Say That Schools Include Courses on Negro History	72% (N = 53)	44% (N = 9)	46% (N = 13)	32% (N = 37)
	Sig .05		NS	
Felt That Schools Are Racist	28% (N = 46)	10% (N = 20)	0% (N = 15)	20% (N = 61)
	Sig .05		Sig .01	
Schools Should Make an Effort to Improve Race Relations	80% (N = 76)	91% (N = 23)	93% (N = 30)	65% (N = 104)
	NS		Sig .001	
Say That Schools are Making an Effort	80% (N = 61)	95% (N = 20)	86% (N = 21)	79% (N = 86)
	Sig .05		NS	

TABLE J

School Involvement of Parents From Different Income Groups

Percent of Parents Who:	Inner City			Middle City			Suburbia		
	Low Income	Moderate Income	High Income	Low Income	Moderate Income	High Income	Low Income	Moderate Income	High Income
Visit School at Least Three Times a Year	80%	92%	63%	*	51%	48%	*	33%	64%
Phone Teachers and School Officials at Least Three Times a Year	30%	27%	10%	*	20%	17%	*	11%	30%
Belong to PTA (PTO)	80%	58%	38%	*	19% (sig.01)	50%	*	0%	45%
Attend PTA Meetings at Least Three Times a Year	63%	71%	33%	*	33% (sig.05)	70%	*	0%	55%
Feel They Have Influence	20%	47%	35%	12%	22%	34%	13%	42%	47%

* N's too small

TABLE K

Relationship Between Income and Racial Attitudes in Different Sections of the City

After Deleting Non-Respondents, Percent Who:	Inner			Middle			Suburbia		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Favor Integration	83% (N = 36)	90% (N = 30)	100% (N = 21)	63% (N = 24)	57% (N = 40)	69% (N = 68)	50% (N = 22)	70% (N = 20)	82% (N = 19)
	High > Low, .01			NS			High > Low, .001		
Feel Integration Successful	73% (N = 33)	40% (N = 25)	29% (N = 17)	57% (N = 21)	64% (N = 39)	44% (N = 63)	29% (N = 17)	31% (N = 16)	54% (N = 82)
	Low > Medium, .01 Low > High, .001			High < Low, .05 High < Medium, .05			High > Low, .05 High > Medium, .05		
Say Schools Include Courses on Negro History	78% (N = 18)	78% (N = 18)	43% (N = 14)	N's too small			N's too small		
	High < Low, .05 High < Medium, .05								
Feel Schools are Racist	14% (N = 28)	30% (N = 20)	9% (N = 11)	16% (N = 12)	13% (N = 19)	36% (N = 47)	0% (N = 14)	13% (N = 15)	(N = 61)
		NS		NS			Low > Medium, .001 Low > High, .01		
Schools Should Make Effort to Improve Race Relations	71% (N = 34)	87% (N = 30)	86% (N = 21)	85% (N = 26)	68% (N = 38)	68% (N = 73)	75% (N = 14)	75% (N = 11)	75% (N = 60)
		NS		NS					
School Are Making an Effort	85% (N = 27)	83% (N = 24)	82% (N = 47)	85% (N = 20)	72% (N = 29)	85% (N = 62)	93% (N = 14)	82% (N = 11)	88% (N = 60)
		NS			NS				

III. Summary Statements, Columbus Data

A. Demographic Characteristics of the Two Samples

1. In contrast to the middle-city, the inner-city is characterized by a much larger proportion of Negroes and lower income residents. Within the inner-city, however, Negroes and whites are fairly comparable in terms of income.
2. Inner-city residents are significantly older than middle-city sample.
   a. Within the inner-city, whites are significantly older than Negroes
   b. In both the middle-city and inner-city, the low income sample is predominantly an older age group.
3. As we move from the inner-city out to the middle-city, education of the respondents increases.
   a. Within the inner-city, Negroes are better educated than the white sample (a difference of 16 percent having gone to college).
   b. Within both sectors of the city, income and education are positively related.
4. Inner-city residents are less likely to have children enrolled in the public schools but this largely reflects age differences between inner- and middle-city residents. The smaller proportion of low income people with children in the public schools is also largely explainable in terms of age. Inner-city residents, and low income groups in both sectors of the city, are significantly older.
5. Very few people, regardless of race, income, or sector of the city, report having children enrolled in nonpublic schools.

B. Perception of the System as a Whole

1. Middle-city respondents are considerably more concerned about overcrowding of the schools while inner-city respondents express a greater number of concerns instead of focusing on overcrowding. Neither race not income seem to differentiate these general evaluations of the school system.
2. Low income people, regardless of race and regardless of the sector of the city in which they live, express a heightened concern that the schools should fill community needs beyond the education of children.
3. Evaluation of how well elementary, junior high and senior high schools are preparing students for jobs is consistent and fairly negative in both sections of the city. Regardless of income and in both the inner and middle-cities, about 35 to 45 percent of parents interviewed feel the schools are doing either a "fair" or "poor" job of occupational preparation. Within the inner-city, however, blacks are considerably more critical than whites. The race difference is not as sizable in Columbus as it was in Detroit, but still there are at least twice as many Negroes as whites who feel the schools are doing a fair or poor job of vocational preparation.

C. Evaluation of Teachers

Teachers are evaluated very similarly in the inner and middle-city of Columbus. Furthermore, neither race nor income are related to teacher ratings.

D. Evaluation of Curriculum

Curriculum is evaluated very similarly in both sectors of the city. Furthermore, neither race nor income are related to curriculum responses.

E. Evaluation of School Buildings

School buildings are also viewed very consensually in different parts of the city and by the various income groups as well as by blacks and whites.

F. Parental Involvement and Influence in Schools

Parents in the two section of the city are fairly equally involved in the schools and perceive how much influence they have over the schools in very similar ways.

a. Except for the fact that Negro parents do report belonging to the PTA in larger numbers, Negroes and whites are similar with respect to school involvement. Negro parents are more apt to feel they have influence over schools, however.

b. In both the inner and middle-city, school involvement and perception of influence over the schools increases as income of the parent increases.

G. Racial Attitudes

1. Many fewer middle-city parents report that the schools in the community are integrated.

2. Although middle and inner-city respondents are fairly similar in attitudes toward school integration, more inner-city residents feel integration has been successful and feel the schools should make an effort to improve race relations.

a. Negroes are considerably more favorable toward school integration and express in larger numbers that schools should make an effort to improve race relations. Negroes and whites do not differ much, however, in how successful they feel integration has been,

in whether they feel the schools are racist, or in how much effort they feel the schools are currently expending in the area of race relations.

b. Income matters very little in differentiating respondents' attitudes in either the inner- or middle-city.

H. Differences Between the Columbus and Detroit Data

1. The objective situation of Negroes and whites in the inner-cities of Detroit and Columbus are somewhat different.

a. Negroes make up a larger proportion of the inner-city sample in Detroit than in Columbus.

b. In Detroit it is the Negro sample, and in Columbus the white sample that is disproportionately older.

c. A somewhat greater racial disadvantage is experienced by Negroes in Columbus than in Detroit. Although inner-city Negroes are better educated than inner-city whites in Columbus, they are not earning higher incomes. In contrast, the inner-city Negro and white samples in Detroit are markedly similar with respect to both education and income.

2. In Detroit we learned that it is really the white parents in the middle-city who are most likely to send their children to nonpublic schools. The middle-city white parents, regardless of income, stand out from all other subgroups in Detroit, This does not hold up in Columbus. Very few people, regardless of race or sector of the city, report having children enrolled in nonpublic schools in Columbus.

3. In general, the inner and middle-city samples are much more similar in their perceptions and attitudes about the schools as well as participation in the schools in Columbus than they are in Detroit. The heightened concern about teachers among inner-city residents in Detroit does not show up in Columbus. Moreover, teachers are evaluated very similarly in different sectors of Columbus while teacher ratings are lower in the inner-city than in other sectors of Detroit. Curriculum and school buildings also are evaluated very similarly in both sectors of Columbus while they are evaluated more negatively in the inner-city than in other areas of Detroit, Finally, parent participation and perception of influence over the schools are about the same in both the inner and middle sectors of Columbus, while participation and perceived influence vary in different sectors of Detroit.

4. We also see fewer race differences in the Columbus data. Overall perceptions of the school system are not related to race in Columbus; the heightened concern about teachers is particularly characteristic of inner-city Negroes in Detroit. The greater dissatisfaction with school buildings among black respondents in Detroit also does not emerge in the Columbus data. Finally, the size of race differences in racial attitudes is considerably smaller in Columbus than in Detroit.

5. One of the few ways in which the Columbus data do mirror the race results from Detroit has to do with increased criticism of the job the schools are doing to prepare students for jobs among black parents in both cities. The race differences are not as sizable in

Columbus as they are in Detroit although there still are at least twice as many Negro parents as white parents in Columbus who feel the schools are doing a fair or poor job of vocational preparation.

IV. Description of Findings, Columbus

A. Demographic Characteristics of the Inner and Middle Samples in Columbus

The inner- and middle-city samples differ greatly in both race and income. Almost all of the inner-city sample, but only two percent of the middle-city sample is Negro. This means that whenever we are interested in comparing the responses of Negroes and whites, we must restrict it only to respondents from the inner-city in Columbus. Income differences between the inner- and middle-city are also enormous. Nearly three-quarters of the inner-city residents but only 14 percent of middle-city residents report earning less than $7,000 a year; conversely, approximately four-fifths of the middle-city but only 12 percent of the inner-city residents are in the category of $10,000 or above (see Tables A and B).

Given these differences between the inner- and middle-city samples, it is important to control for both race and income when drawing conclusions about the school attitudes and experiences of respondents living in the two different sections of Columbus. The size of the sample, however, makes it impossible to control for both race and income simultaneously. Therefore, in the tables to follow, we will present each of the controls separately. To feel comfortable about using race and income as separate controls, however, we need to show that they are not strongly related themselves. If, for instance, Negroes in the inner-city have much

lower income than whites in the inner-city, every time we control for race there is also the possibility of income differences confounding our interpretations. Fortunately, this turned out not to be the case (see Table C). Negroes and whites in the inner-city in Columbus have almost exactly the same income distributions.

1. Relationship Between Race and Other Demographic Characteristics

Overall, we know that inner-city residents are significantly older than the middle-city sample. Nearly a quarter of the people interviewed in the inner-city were 65 years or older, while this was true of only nine percent of the middle-city respondents. When we control for race, we find that it is particularly the inner-city whites who are older. Over a third of the white sample but only 12 percent of the Negro sample in the inner-city are that old. Conversely, twice as many of the Negroes interviewed were younger than 30 (see Table D).

We would expect these age differences between the Negro and white samples to be reflected in differences in marital status of the two groups as well. This is the case to some extent. Twenty percent of the white sample but only eight percent of the Negro sample are widows or widowers. This is what we would expect with an older sample. In contrast, a larger proportion of the Negro sample in the inner-city is still single (see Table E).

Overall, the inner-city sample, in comparison with the middle-city, is much less well educated. Only 11 percent, in contrast to 34 percent in the middle-city, report having at least some college education. When we look within the inner-city, we find that Negroes

are better educated than the white sample. Twenty-two percent of the Negro sample but only six percent of the white sample have gone to college (see Table F). This may partly reflect the fact that the Negro sample is younger, although this would not entirely explain the race difference.

Certain of these demographic characteristics of the inner-city samples in Columbus are considerably different from the situation in Detroit. In Detroit, it was Negroes (not whites) in the inner-city who were significantly older. Moreover, in Detroit we found no race differences in educational attainment. This means that in Columbus, there is somewhat greater disadvantage experienced by blacks. Although the inner-city blacks are better educated than the whites, they are not earning higher incomes than the whites in Columbus. In Detroit, in contrast, the Negro and white samples were markedly similar with respect to both education and income.

2. Relationships Between Income and Other Demographic Characteristics

Family income is related to other demographic characteristics of the respondents in almost exactly the same way in both the inner- and middle-cities. Low income people, regardless of which section of the city in which they are living, are disaproportionately older (see Table D). In contrast, the middle and high income groups are located in the age groups of 30 to 50. As we would expect from these relationships between income and age, we also find that there is a larger proportion of widows and widowers among the low income than among the other two groups (see Table E).

Apart from this difference, however, the various income groups, A at least in the inner-city, have very similar types of family structures. In the middle-city, the low income groups is different in other ways as well. There are considerably more divorced respondents among the low income group. Nevertheless, we should bear in mind that the sample of low income respondents in the middle-city is very small. Finally, income and education are similarly related in both sectors of the city (see Table F). Low income people are considerably less well educated, high income people considerably more educated. Still, the size of this relationship (a correlation of about .35 in both the inner- and middle- samples) is not as large as we generally expect. We can see in Table F that this results because the high income group is not as disproportionately located among the college-educated as we sometimes find.

The relationships between income and these other characteristics are fairly similar in both Columbus and Detroit.

3. Involvement of the Respondents in Public and Nonpublic Schools

We learn from the MOR Report that inner-city residents are less likely to have children enrolled in the public schools. However, this largely reflects the age differences between the two parts of the city. A much larger proportion of inner-city than middle-city residents are older than 40. When we control for age, this difference in having children attending public schools disappears. The people in the inner-city who are younger than 40 are just as likely to have children in public schools as are those in this age group in the middle-city. Moreover, the significance of age is also reflected in income differences within both sectors of the city. Poor people,

who are also significantly older, are less likely to have children in public schools in either the inner- or middle-city. It is just that there are a larger number of both old and poor people in the inner-city, which accounts for the original difference reported in the Executive Summary Report from Market Opinion Research. Finally, when we control for race in the inner-city, we find that Negroes and whites are equally likely to have children in the public schools.

The picture we found in Detroit of middle-city whites sending their children to nonpublic schools in greater numbers than any other subgroup does not hold up in Columbus. In the first place, there is no evidence that middle-city white respondents differ from either Negroes or whites in the inner-city in Columbus. Moreover, income does not differentiate who sends their children to nonpublic schools within either sector of the city. Very few people, regardless of race, income, or sector of the city (somewhere between four and eight percent), report having children enrolled in nonpublic schools in Columbus.

4. Relationship of Race and Income to Paying of Property Taxes

We know from the MOR report that a much larger proportion of middle-city (94 percent) than inner-city (50 percent) respondents say they pay property taxes. This difference, however, is largely accounted for by the very sizable income differences between the two sectors of the city. We find very much the same picture as we did in Detroit when we control for race and income. Within the inner-city, Negroes and whites do not differ in frequency of paying

property taxes. Furthermore, just as in Detroit, family income within the inner-city of Columbus make a very considerable difference, while, within the middle-city income is not related to paying of property taxes. This means that middle-city residents are likely to own their own homes regardless of their family income while it is only the families with incomes of $7,000 or above who are apt to own homes in the inner-city (see Table G).

B. Perceptions of the Public School System

The situation we described in Detroit -- the heightened concern about teachers (teachers lacking interest, not enough teachers, lack of communication between parents and teachers) within the inner-city and particularly among inner-city Negroes -- does not characterize the Columbus data. Instead, we find that the major difference between middle- and inner-city respondents is a much greater concern in the middle-city about overcrowding in the schools. Deleting people who did not respond to this question, about 50 percent of the middle-city respondents but only 19 percent of the inner-city stressed overcrowded conditions as a major problem of the public school system. Quality of teaching does not stand out as a distinctive concern in either sector of the city. What we find in the inner-city of Columbus is a greater number of concerns being mentioned than is true among the middle-city respondents. Instead of focusing almost entirely on overcrowding, a larger number of problems are mentioned. Of course, we should not overlook the fact that nonrespondents are more frequent within the inner-city (48 percent versus 30 percent in the middle-city). But, among those who do answer this question in the inner-city, the responses are

of a more differentiated sort than in the middle-city.

Another way in which the Columbus data are quite different from the Detroit data is the fact that we find no evidence for race differences in the inner-city of Columbus. In Detroit, inner-city Negroes were much more concerned about teachers and inner-city whites more concerned about discipline in the schools. Finally, in contrast to Detroit, we find little evidence that income differentiates the responses people make to this question.

The MOR report indicates that inner-city residents are twice as likely as middle-city residents to suggest that public schools should try to fill community needs other than education of children. This difference is reduced, however, when the nonrespondents are deleted. Looking just at people who answer the question, 60 percent of the inner-city residents and 43 percent of the middle-city residents responded affirmatively. In both sectors of the city, there are rather sizable income differences. In the inner-city, 70 percent of the low income group but only 18 percent of the high income group feel that schools should fill more community needs. In the middle-city, the differences are somewhat smaller but still significant. Sixty-three percent of low income people and 35 percent of the high income people responded affirmatively in the middle-city. Race does not seem to affect the attitudes expressed by people in the inner-city. This means that low income people, regardless of race and regardless of the part of the city in which they live, express a quite heightened concern about the schools filling community needs. The dominant expression, as indicated in the MOR report, is for recreational programs such as swimming, gym and

sports. This is equally true in the inner- and middle-city and particularly true of low income respondents.

C. Evaluation of Teachers

When we examine the questions asking respondents to rate teachers in the schools, we find that the picture of greater criticism of teachers in the inner-city, which characterized the Detroit data, does not hold up in Columbus. When we delete the nonrespondents, we find very similar ratings of teachers in the inner- and middle-city of Columbus. This is true of the ratings of teachers in general as well as teachers at the different elementary, junior high and senior high levels (see Table H).

Two aspects of the Columbus data are simlar to the Detroit situation, however. In Columbus, as in Detroit, criticism of teachers increases at the junior and senior high levels. Furthermore, in Columbus, as in Detroit, we find no evidence that Negroes differ from whites in their reactions to teachers, or that evaluations of teachers are affected by income of the respondents.

All of this means that evaluations of teachers in Columbus are very homogeneous; evaluations do not seem to differ by sector of the city, race of the respondent, or income of the respondent. Overall, most of the respondents in Columbus are very positive in rating teachers in the public schools.

D. Evaluation of School Building and Curriculum

We see in the MOR report that evaluations of school buildings and curriculum are very similar in the inner- and middle-city of Columbus. The vast majority of respondents in both sectors of the city

are satisfied. This is even more striking when the nonrespondents are deleted, with close to 90 percent of all respondents expressing satisfaction with both school buildings and curriculum. Given this homogenity of reaction, we could hardly expect sizable race or income differences within different sectors of the city. And this turns out to be the case. Negroes and whites, as well as different income groups, express very much the same opinions.

Here, again is evidence that the inner-city in Columbus does not stand out as it does in Detroit. In Detroit we found that both school buildings and curriculum were evaluated more negatively in the inner-city.

Evaluation of Schools' Capacity to Prepare Students for Jobs

We learn from the MOR report that parents in both sections of Columbus are consistent in evaluating how well the public school system prepares students for jobs. Deleting nonrespondents, about 35 to 45 percent of parents interviewed feel the schools are doing either a "fair" or "poor" job in occupational preparation. In neither section of the city does the income of the parent affect his evaluation of the schools' effectiveness in this matter.

What we do find, however, is the same kind of race differences that we found in Detroit. Blacks are much more critical of the success of the school, at all grade levels (elementary, junior high and senior high), in preparing students for jobs. The race differences in Columbus are not as sizable as they were in Detroit, but still there are at least twice as many Negroes as whites who feel the schools are doing a fair or poor job in vocational preparation (see Table I).

This is one of the few ways in which the Columbus data do mirror what we learned in Detroit. This probably means that, regardless of local conditions, Negro parents are going to be much more critical than white parents of the vocational relevance of the public schools. School personnel can easily feel that this problem stems from discriminatory factors over which they have little control rather than a problem that comes from an inadequate vocational program within the schools. Nevertheless, these data from Columbus and Detroit clearly show that Negro parents are dissatisfied with what the schools are doing in the job preparation area and would strongly support school programs that would combat job discrimination and enhance the "payoffs" of education for Negro youngsters.

E. Parental Involvement and Influence in School Affairs

The picture of parental involvement in the schools is very different in Columbus from what it was in Detroit. In Detroit it was the inner-city parents who were both most involved and felt they had the greatest influence over the schools. In Columbus, however, parents in the two sections of the city are fairly equally involved (see Table J). They do not differ in how often they visit the schools, how often they phone teachers or officials at the schools, or how often they attend PTA meetings. Middle-city parents do tend to belong to the PTA in somewhat larger numbers, but this is the only difference that emerges. Moreover, perceived influence over the schools is very similar--34 percent of inner-city parents and 40 percent of middle-city parents feel they can influence the operation of the schools.

The race data from Columbus are fairly similar to the Detroit results. Negro parents in Columbus report, in larger numbers, belonging to the PTA. This is also true of Negro parents in Detroit, at least in the middle-city of Detroit. Otherwise, Negroes and whites are very similar in how involved they are in the public schools. Just as was true in Detroit, a larger proportion of the Negro parents do feel they can influence the schools. Forty-eight percent of the Negro parents but only 19 percent of the white parents in the inner-city of Columbus feel they have influence over the schools. This is approximately the same size difference that existed in the inner-city of Detroit as well.

Income relates to school involvement and perception of influence in the way we would expect. Higher income parents visit the school more frequently, belong to the PTA in larger numbers, attend PTA meetings more frequently, and feel they have greater influence over the schools. These relationships were what we found in the middle and suburban areas of Detroit but not the way income affected involvement and influence in the inner-city in Detroit. There we found the paradoxical situation of low income parents in the inner-city visiting the school and belonging to the PTA more frequently but feeling they had the least influence over the schools. In Columbus, however, involvement and influence are fairly congruent, with low income people being less involved as well as feeling they have the least influence (see Table J).

F. Racial Attitudes

Many fewer middle-city parents (37 percent) than inner-city parents (95 percent) report that the schools in their community are integrated.

These differences hold regardless of income of the respondents; similar reports about school integration are made by low and high income respondents. Moreover, Negroes and whites within the inner-city give very similar reports.

When we turn to racial attitudes, we see a more complex picture. Although middle and inner-city respondents are fairly similar in how much they favor school integration (about 70 percent in both sectors of the city expressing positive attitudes), they do differ in some other ways. Twice as many of the inner-city respondents feel that integration has been successful (61 percent versus 30 percent in the middle-city); five times as many inner-city respondents express the view that the schools are racist, even though this is still only 30 percent of the inner-city sample; considerably more of the inner-city respondents feel that the schools should make an effort to improve race relations; finally, a larger proportion of inner-city respondents also report that the schools <u>are</u> making this kind of effort (see Table K). Thus, inner-city respondents hold generally more favorable attitudes about racial issues while, at the same time, they are also more critical of the school.

Income matters very little in differentiating respondents' attitudes. It is only in attitudes about school integration that we find an increasingly positive attitude as income increases. This positive effect of income is seen in both the inner- and middle-city samples. Income does not matter, however, in the other attitudinal questions that were measured (see TAble K).

Just as we found in Detroit, Negroes and whites have somewhat different

attitudes. Negroes are considerably more favorable toward school integration and express, in larger numbers, that schools should make an effort to improve race relations. They do not differ much from the white respondents in the inner-city in how successful they feel integration has been, in whether they feel the schools are racist, or in how much effort they feel the schools are currently expending in the area of race relations. Certainly the polarization between blacks and whites is in no way as sharp in Columbus as it is in the Detroit data. Where differences exist, they are not as large as they were in Detroit; moreover, there are considerably fewer race differences in Columbus.

We would not want this focus on the way in which sector of the city, race and income of respondent differentiate racial attitudes to confuse the fact that a very large proportion of respondents everywhere in Columbus are reasonably positive in their racial attitudes. Nearly three-quarters of the respondents favor integration and, in the inner-city, the vast majority are also postitive about the school trying to improve race relations.

TABLE A

Breakdown of Inner and Middle Samples by Race

	Inner	Middle
Negro	48.1%	2.0%
White	48.1	95.0
Other	3.8	3.0
Total	100%	100%
N	104	100

TABLE B

Breakdown of Inner and Middle Samples by Income, Deleting Refusals

	Inner	Middle
Less than $1,000	73.2%	14.4%
$7,000 - $9,999	14.4	27.8
$10,000+	12.4	57.7
Total	100%	100%
N	97	97

TABLE C

Relationship Between Race and Income in the Inner-City, Deleting Refusals

	Inner-City	
	Negro	White
Less than $7,000	73.2%	74.5%
$7,000 - $9,999	17.1	11.8
$10,000 or more	9.8	13.7
Total	100%	100%
N	43	50

TABLE D

Breakdown of Inner and Middle Samples by Age, Controlling for Race and Income

	Inner	Middle	Inner		Inner			Middle		
			Negro	White	Low Inc.	Medium Income	High Inc.	Low Inc.	Medium Income	High Inc.
18-20	7%	1%	10%	2%	7%	-	9%	-	4%	-
21-29	21	20	26	16	22	23%	9	23%	26	20%
30-39	18	35	14	20	12	46	18	8	33	43
40-49	15	19	18	13	13	15	36	23	19	19
50-59	9	12	16	7	9	8	18	8	19	9
60-64	6	4	4	7	6	8	0	-	-	7
65+	24	9	12	36	31	-	9	39	-	2
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	104	103	50	46	68	14	12	13	27	54

TABLE E

Breakdown of Inner and Middle Samples by Marital Status, Controlling for Race and Income

			Inner		Inner			Middle		
	Inner	Middle	Negro	White	Low Inc.	Middle Income	High Inc.	Low Inc.	Middle Income	High Inc.
Married	71%	88%	68%	71%	65%	85%	91%	46%	89%	100%
Separated	1	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Single	9	3	14	4	10	8	9	8	7	-
Divorced	7	3	8	4	7	8	-	23	-	-
Widow/widower	12	6	8	20	16	-	-	23	4	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	104	103	50	47	68	14	12	13	27	54

TABLE F

Breakdown of Inner and Middle Samples by Education, Controlling for Race and Income

	Inner	Middle	Inner		Inner			Middle		
			Negro	White	Low Inc.	Middle Income	High Inc.	Low Inc.	Middle Income	High Inc.
Grade School or Less	32%	5%	22%	42%	38%	23%	-	15%	4%	4%
Some High School	29	18	33	20	35	15	18%	54	15	11
Graduated from High School	29	44	24	31	21	46	36	23	56	41
Some College	9	22	16	4	4	15	36	8	22	26
Graduated From College	2	7	2	2	1	-	9	-	4	11
Post-Graduate	-	5	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	104	101	51	45	68	14	12	13	27	54

TABLE G

Breakdown of Respondents Reporting
Paying Property Taxes by Income and Race

Percent Paying Property Taxes	Inner	Middle	Inner Negro	Inner White	Inner Low Inc.	Inner Middle Income	Inner High Inc.	Middle Low Inc.	Middle Middle Income	Middle High Inc.
Yes	50%	94%	48%	52%	41%	77%	82%	92%	89%	96%
No	40	6	52	48	59	23	18	8	11	14
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	93	94	48	45	68	13	11	13	27	54

TABLE H

Ratings of Teachers by Respondents in the Inner and Middle City, Controlling for Race and Income (Deleting Nonrespondents)

General Satisfaction With Teachers	Inner	Middle	Inner: Negro	Inner: White	Inner: Low Inc.	Inner: Middle Income	Inner: High Inc.	Middle: Low Inc.	Middle: Middle Income	Middle: High Inc.
Satisfied	83%	94%	84%	86%	87%	73%	67%	100%	96%	92%
Not Satisfied	17	6	16	14	13	27	33	-	4	8
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	NS		NS		NS			NS		
Rating of High School Teachers										
Excellent	24%	21%	22%	25%	25%	33%	33%	20%	30%	23%
Good	57	64	57	58	63	33	33	60	60	62
Fair	10	14	22	0	13	0	0	20	10	15
Poor	10	0	0	17	0	33	33	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	NS		NS		NS			NS		
Rating of Junior High Teachers										
Excellent	16%	21%	8%	25%	13%	25%	0%	20%	25%	20%
Good	64	58	77	50	73	25	53	60	50	60
Fair	16	21	15	17	13	50	30	20	25	20
Poor	4	-	0	8	-	-	17	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	NS		NS		NS			NS		
Rating of Elementary Teachers										
Excellent	28%	35%	26%	29%	24%	57%	33%	34%	47%	34%
Good	64	58	68	59	62	43	33	51	47	60
Fair	6	5	5	6	10	-	33	14	7	3
Poor	3	2	-	6	5	-	0	0	0	3
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	NS		NC		NS			NS		
Extent To Which Respondents Feel Their Children Are Satisfied With Their Teachers										
Satisfied at Elementary Level	86%	91%	89%	82%	76%	86%	100%	100%	93%	89%
Satisfied at Junior High Level	82	88	79	83	93	60	67	100	80	81
Satisfied at Senior High Level	86	80	83	88	N's too small			N's too small		
N	104	100	49	47	68	14	12	13	29	54

TABLE I

Evaluations by Parents of How Well Schools are Preparing Students for Jobs, Controlling for Race

Evaluation of Elementary Schools	Inner	Middle	Inner	
			Negroes	Whites
Excellent	18%	15%	25%	41%
Good	39	44	20	61
Fair	21	31	30	11
Poor	21	10	25	17
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	104	100	50	50
		NS		Sig .05
Evaluation of Junior High Schools				
Excellent	22%	10%	28%	14%
Good	34	54	17	57
Fair	31	24	39	21
Poor	13	12	17	7
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
		NS		Sig .05
Evaluation of Senior High Schools				
Excellent	22%	8%	27%	17%
Good	44	49	20	75
Fair	19	14	33	8
Poor	15	30	20	0
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
		NS		Sig .05

TABLE J

School Involvement of Parents, Controlling for Race and Income

Percent of Parents Who	Inner	Middle	Inner Negro	Inner White	Inner Low Inc.	Inner Middle Income	Inner High Inc.	Middle Low Inc.	Middle Middle Income	Middle High Inc.
Visit school at least three times a year	67%	54%	65%	68%	62%	57%	88%	38%	47%	69%
	NS		NS		Sig .05			Sig .05		
Phone teachers and officials at least three times a year	28%	27%	24%	30%	34%	0%	35%	13%	29%	31%
	NS		NS							
Belong to the PTA (PTO) %	62%	81%	79%	44%	40%	57%	100%	53%	82%	84%
	Sig .05		Sig .01		Sig .05			Sig 105		
Attend PTA meetings at least three times a year	70%	72%	73%	67%	64%	50%	100%	60%	64%	77%
	NS		NS		Sig .05			NS		
Feel they have influence over the operation of the schools	34%	40%	48%	19%	22%	36%	52%	9%	40%	50%
	NS		Sig .05		Sig .05			Sig .05		

TABLE K

Relationship Between Income and Race of Respondents and Their Racial Attitudes

Percent Who	Inner	Middle	Inner Negro	Inner White	Inner Low Inc.	Inner Middle Income	Inner High Inc.	Middle Low Inc.	Middle Middle Income	Middle High Inc.
Favor school integration	71%	72%	88%	62%	72%	77%	91%	61%	70%	82%
	NS		Sig .05		Sig .05			Sig .05		
Feel integration has been successful	61%	30%	67%	56%	62%	69%	34%	31%	37%	26%
	Sig .01		NS		NS			NS		
Feel schools are racist (deleting those who do not have an opinion)	30%	6%	36%	28%	37%	10%	14%	0%	11%	6%
	Sig .05		NS		NS			NS		
Schools should make an effort to improve race relations (deleting those with no opinion)	86%	52%	93%	75%	85%	92%	83%	50%	50%	54%
	Sig .01		Sig .05		NS			NS		
Schools are making an effort	89%	56%	82%	93%	89%	86%	89%	43%	50%	61%
	Sig .01		NS		NS			NS		